1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON	
8	AT TACOMA	
9	MARK DANIEL ROLLINS,	NO. C10-5438 RBL/KLS
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
11	v.	MOTION TO AMEND AS MOOT
12	PIERCE COUNTY CORRECTIONAL	
13	FACILITY, CORRECTIONS OFFICER PAPP, SGT. HARDGROVE, and	
14	CORRECTIONS OFFICER SHAVIRI,	
15	Defendants.	
16	Before the court is Plaintiff's "Motion to Amend." ECF No. 31. For the reasons	
17	stated below, the court finds that the motion should be denied as moot. Plaintiff was directed	
18	to file an amended complaint on or before December 26, 2010. ECF No. 29.	
19	BACKGROUND	
20	Plaintiff sued the Pierce County Correctional Facility and Officer Papp, Sgt.	
21		
22	Hardgrove, and Correctional Officer Shaviri, employees of the Pierce County Jail. ECF No.	
23	7, pp. 2-3. Plaintiff alleges that on February 19, 2010, while he was a pre-trial detainee at the	
24	Pierce County Jail, Officer Papp assaulted him by slamming his face into a wall. <i>Id.</i> , p. 3.	
25	Plaintiff alleges that he suffered a broken nose and is now permanently disfigured and has	
26		

ORDER 1

breathing complications. *Id.* Plaintiff further alleges that Defendants Hardgrove and Correctional Officer Shaviri "tride [sic] covering it up." *Id.* 

On November 26, 2010, Defendants' motion to dismiss Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Pierce County Correctional Facility was granted. ECF No. 29. Defendants motion to dismiss Plaintiff's claims against Defendants Hardgrove and Shaviri was denied and Plaintiff was granted leave to file an amended complaint on or before December 26, 2010 to allege facts relating to Defendants Hardgrove and Shaviri only. *Id*.

On December 16, 2010, Plaintiff filed a "Motion to Amend" requesting leave to amend his complaint against Defendants Hardgrove and Shaviri. ECF No. 31.

## **DISCUSSION**

Plaintiff has not submitted an amended complaint as directed. An amended complaint supersedes the original in its entirety, making the original as if it never existed. The allegations contained in Plaintiff's motion to amend are not sufficient to properly plead an amended complaint to include all of his factual and legal allegations, including those stated in his original complaint.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 8(a) requires that a complaint contain a "short and plain statement" sufficient to put the opposing party on notice of the claims against which it must defend. Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 8(a). Specifically, Rule 8(a) states:

[a] pleading which sets forth a claim for relief ... shall contain (1) a short and plain statement of the grounds upon which the court's jurisdiction depends ... (2) a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, and (3) a demand for judgment for the relief the pleader seeks. Relief in the alternative or of several different types may be demanded.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Additionally, each allegation in a pleading "must be simple, concise, and direct." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(d)(2).

ORDER 2

In order to satisfy the standards for federal pleadings, Plaintiff's complaint must include factual allegations of the circumstances and events that support each claim he is asserting against Defendants Hardgrove and Shaviri. Rule 8 does not require a heightened level of pleading for most claims; but each claim must be supported by facts that, if proven to be true, would satisfy the elements of each claim raised in the Complaint.

Plaintiff is further advised that an amended complaint operates as a <u>complete</u> substitute for (rather than a mere supplement to) the present complaint. In other words, an amended complaint supersedes the original in its entirety, making the original as if it never existed. Therefore, reference to another document is not an acceptable amendment. Plaintiff must include all of his factual allegations, legal claims, and requests for relief in his amended complaint.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Amend (ECF No. 31) is **DENIED as moot**. Plaintiff was given leave to file an amended complaint on or before December 26, 2010. The court will extend that deadline until **January 28, 2011.** If Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint by that time, the court will recommend dismissal of this lawsuit as frivolous. The Clerk shall send copies of this Order to Plaintiff and to counsel for Defendants.

**DATED** this <u>11th</u> day of January, 2011.

Karen L. Strombom

United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER 3